## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-10 and 12-18 are currently pending in this application.  Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 18 are amended.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102*

Claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. 2004/0259536 to Keskar et al.( hereinafter "Keskar").

Regarding claims 1, 6, 12 and 13, Keskar fails to teach an electronic cognitive device in which adjustments are made based on calculated predictability factors when the predictability factors reach a predetermined level.  The electronic cognitive device in Keskar requires the user to "create and configure User Preferences" in lieu of using default User Preferences (see Keskar [0017]).  Even when in "learning" mode, the device in Keskar requires the user to configure the device's learning behavior to ensure optimum functionality (see Keskar [0018]).  In other words, if the user of the Keskar device wishes to have the device learn a particular function for a given condition, the user must configure the device to learn from the user's pattern of behavior (see Keskar [0018]).

Since Keskar fails to teach every element disclosed in claims 1, 6, 12 and 13, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 6, 12 and 13 are allowable over the

cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections of claims 1, 6, 12 and 13.

Regarding claim 18, Keskar fails to teach a method of optimizing user inputs in a user cognitive device capable of receiving inputs from a plurality of users. The methods taught by Keskar are limited to single-user devices. Therefore, the methods in Keskar are incapable of distinguishing actions from multiple users.

Since Keskar fails to teach every element disclosed in claim 18, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claim 18.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103*

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2004/0259536 to Keskar et al.( hereinafter "Keskar") as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Well Known Prior Art – Official Notice.

Claim 7 is dependent upon claim 6 which the Applicants believe is allowable over the cited reference for the same reasons provided above. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 7.

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 14-17 are either directly or indirectly dependent upon claims 1, 6, 12 or 13, and the Applicants believe these claims are allowable over the cited references of record for the same reasons provided above.

Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12-18 is respectfully requested. Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

## *Conclusion*

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephonic interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Ozluturk et al.

By _____
Wesley T. McMichael
Registration No. 56,982

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA  19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile:  (215) 568-6499

WTM/NCM/ls